

PATENT
09/627,223

This is response to the Official Action mailed June 24, 2004, which was a Final Rejection of all of the claims in this Application.

Remarks

All of the claims of the present Application have been rejected over Narayanaswami (US6,182,113) which as Examiner has already noted is owned by IBM Corporation, the common assignee in the present Application. Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13-16 and 20-24, are rejected as anticipated by Narayanaswami under 35 USC 102(e), and claims 3-5, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of this commonly owned Narayanaswami patent in view of Duval et al. (US5,884,033).

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider these rejections based upon Narayanaswami for the following reasons. The commonly owned Narayanaswami patent is precluded from being used in any 35 USC 103 rejection under 35 USC 103(c). In addition, the Narayanaswami patent does not have a disclosure of the present claimed invention sufficient to meet the requirements of 35 USC 102.

The present Application and Narayanaswami Patent were commonly owned by International Business Machines Corporation, the Assignee herein at the time the invention of the present Application was made. The file of the present Application indicates that an Assignment of the present Application to said Assignee is filed in the Patent Office. Also the printed Naarayanaswami patent indicates that it is assigned to the same Assignee. Since the present Application has a filing date after November 29, 1999, and the Narayanaswami Patent would qualify as prior art under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(e), it is submitted that the Narayanaswami patent can not be used to preclude

AUS920000273US1

2

PATENT
09/627,223

patentability based upon 35 U.S.C. 103(c). [Examiner's attention is directed to MPEP Sections [706.02(1); (1)(1); (1)(2); and (1)(3).] Accordingly, Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw Narayanaswami a reference in the 35 USC 103(a) rejection.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13-16 and 20-24, as anticipated by Narayanaswami under 35 USC 102(e), it is submitted that a rejection based on anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, must expressly or impliedly teach every element of invention without modification. The Examiner's application of the Narayanaswami does not meet this standard. Applicants do not claim to be the first to recognize that there may be circumstances when the Web documents may be transmitted and presented in a text only mode. That is essentially all that the Narayanaswami teaching has in common with present invention. The present invention goes on to provide an implementation by which the user is enabled to preselect those Web documents which when subsequently received will be downloaded in a text-only mode. A convenient application of this function would be the bookmarked Web document. When a Web document is bookmarked, the user has already previously viewed and may thus evaluate and preselect the state of any subsequent download of the Web document. Similarly, a familiar user may be aware of Web sites and even Web domains which conventionally provide complex Web documents with elaborate graphics and images. Thus, documents from such sources may be preselected for the text-only download mode. The key to the present invention is that although the requested Web documents are hypertext documents and are transmitted from their Web sources as single not multiple hypertext documents, which include graphics, they may be

AUS920000273US1

3

PATENT
09/627,223

selectively downloaded at the receiving terminals in a text-only mode or in the default graphics and text mode.

As Figs. 2, 3A and 3B in Narayanaswami show, the Web pages i.e. Web documents are transmitted from the source as two different pages: one including graphics and one with text-only (Fig. 3A first Web page is "WS A INCLUDE GRAPHICS", and second Web page is "WS A TEXT ONLY").

Unlike the above reference, in the present invention, a process is set up at the receiving station for storing a listing of such preselected documents or document domains which are to be displayed in a text-only mode and comparing received Web documents to the stored list. The same hypertext Web document is downloaded and displayed in a text-only mode if there is a compare to such a stored document or domain designation.

Claims 2, 9, and 16 are further defined as having a bookmark for the requested Web document which indicates whether the document when received is to be downloaded in a text-only mode. Narayanaswami, to the contrary treats the text-only Web document as a separate Web document from the full graphics Web document, and assigns to each a separate bookmark.

Claims 7, 14, and 21 may be further distinguished from the Narayanaswami reference in that they claim the storing of a list at the receiving display station defining which Web documents when received are to be downloaded and displayed in a text-only mode. The teaching of Narayanaswami would lead away from such an embodiment in that the Web documents of Narayanaswami are already in the text-only format when received, and, thus, would not require any comparison to such a stored list.

New claims 22-24 further set forth that the text-only mode in which the preselected received Web documents are

AUS920000273US1

PATENT
09/627,223

downloaded and displayed is an ASCII mode. There is no mention of ASCII downloading in Narayanaswami.

Response to Examiner's Arguments

The Examiner contends that the language of the claims is not limited to Applicants' argued invention wherein there is a single received Web document which may be downloaded in either a hypertext or text only mode. Applicants take issue with this conclusion. Claim 1, as a representative claim, sets forth that a hypertext Web document containing text and images is requested. It then sets forth means at a receiving station for downloading the requested hypertext Web document in its hypertext mode. It further sets forth means enabling the user to download said requested hypertext Web document in a text-only mode. This can leave no doubt that it is the same requested single Web document which can selectively be downloaded in either mode. While claims may be entitled to their broadest interpretation, the Examiner's argument on this point i.e. that a Web document could contain two Web pages, one for text and one for graphic does not seem to have any relevance since he has not cited any such description in the Narayanaswami reference on this point. The Examiner seems to then argue further that even if Narayanaswami does not expressly show this element, the element is well known in the art. This maywell be the case but Examiner has not cited art or at least taken Official Notice of such knowledge in the art.

Applicants note that if Examiner attempts bring in such art or Official Notice of such art in support of the Narayanaswami patent, the rejection based upon Narayanaswami would have to become a rejection under 35 USC 103 instead of the current rejection under 35 USC 102. However, as set forth hereinabove, the Narayanaswami patent is precluded

AUS920000273US1


PATENT
09/627,223

from being used as a 35 USC 103 reference because of 35 USC 103(c).

On the other hand, Applicants have already established above that Narayanaswami clearly fails to meet the standard for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, wherein the reference must expressly or impliedly teach every element of invention without modification.

In view of the foregoing, claims 1-24 are submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested

Respectfully submitted


J. B. Kraft
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 19,226
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Mark Walker
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054
IBM Corporation
11400 Burnet Road
Austin, Texas 78758

AUS920000273US1

6